

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### *- Amendments -*

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be amended as indicated in the accompanying amended page(s), in which:

- Claim 1 is amended; and
- Claim 10 is newly added.

By these amendments, claims 1, 3 - 6, and 8 - 10 are pending. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

### *- Remarks -*

Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for his detailed consideration and remarks, as expressed in the Advisory Action of 6 January 2009.

### 35 USC §103(a)

Independent claim 1 remains rejected under §103(a) over the combination of Suzuki (US 5,847,836) in view of Yuen (US 6,347,863). In the Examiner's detailed remarks as provided in the Advisory Action of 6 January 2009, the Examiner states, in regard to the elongate ink reservoir assembly, that such term is worded broadly enough such that it does not actually require the portion of the "ink reservoir assembly" where the ink is actually stored to also span the width of the printing path.

In this regards, Applicant submits amendments to claim 1 to explicitly clarify that the portion of the ink reservoir assembly where the ink is stored spans the width of the printing path. Claim 1 as amended now recites, *inter alia*:

- an elongate ink reservoir assembly defining at least three ink reservoirs for storing ink, each of the at least three ink reservoirs spanning a width of the printing path

Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment now explicitly distinguishes over the combination of Suzuki and Yuen, and solicits the Examiner's consideration and remarks thereon.

### Claim 6 & Official Notice

Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for his provision of literature (Baldwin - US 5,600,358) supporting his previously taken Official Notice.

Applicant respectfully seeks the Examiner's remarks and consideration on the term "treated" as used in claim 6, in the context of air inlet openings that are treated to be hydrophobic, in view of the following points.

Applicant's interpretation of the term "treated" is that of processing an object with an agent to change the properties of said object. For example, the Merriam-Webster online dictionary at (<http://www.m-w.com>) defines the word "treat" as:

- to act upon with some agent especially to improve or alter <treat a metal with acid>

Claim 6 limits the air inlet openings as being openings that are treated to be hydrophobic. Applicant respectfully submits that such a recitation would be understood by those in the art

as meaning that the material of the openings themselves have been acted upon by an agent such that they now exhibit the property of being hydrophobic.

Applicant believes that this arrangement of claim 6 is distinct from that described in Baldwin, in which a hydrophobic membrane is placed across one end of a passage. Placing a membrane across an end of a passage is respectfully submitted to be different to treating the opening with an agent so as to be hydrophobic.

It may perhaps be said that the membrane has been 'treated' to be hydrophobic, but the opening itself has not been so treated.

Applicant respectfully submits that not even a broadest reasonable interpretation of the term "treat", in the context of treating an opening, can include an arrangement such as that described in Baldwin. Per the above definition of treat by the Merriam-Webster online dictionary, an agent is present in the treating of an object. The passage/labyrinth of Baldwin is clearly not treated by any agent.

The Examiner's reconsideration of claim 6 in light of the above points is respectfully requested.

Applicant looks forward to word of further official communication in due course.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s: Kia

---

Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia  
Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762